

## **REMARKS**

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated March 9, 2006. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19, 21-30, and 32 are now present in this case. Claims 4, 12, 20, and 31 are canceled. Claims 1, 7, 9, 17, and 25 are amended. New claim 32 is added.

The applicants wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor for a telephone conference with the applicants' attorney on April 26, 2006 and for subsequent discussions regarding proposed amendments. In the telephone interview of April 26, 2006, the applicants' attorney discussed the Office Action, particularly as it applies to the alleged teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,921 to Svanbro et al. In the telephone interview, the Examiner adopted the position that Svanbro et al. shows, in Figure 3, that the "relevant portions only of the extracted header are compressed" and noted the time stamp compression discussed in the Office Action at page 3. The applicants' attorney noted that references must be considered as a whole. When reviewing Svanbro et al. in its entirety, it is clear that the remaining portions of the header, shown in Figure 3 as "other" are also compressed by conventional header compression circuit 302.

The Examiner requested additional details regarding the "relevant portions" of the header that are compressed. Although proposed amendments included numerous portions of the header that may be compressed, the introduction of such limitations into claim 1 would be inconsistent with the recitation of original claim 4, which recites that "the header compressor compresses only a payload type header field." For this reason, claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of claim 4. The more detailed recitation of relevant portions has been added as new claim 32. In addition, other independent claims have been amended to clarify that the relevant portions comprise a payload type header field.

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,700,888 to Jonsson et al. combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,680,921 to Svanbro et al. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. The Office Action acknowledges that Johnson et al. does not show a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions of the extracted

header. (See Office Action, page 3.) However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Svanbro et al. discloses a header compressor “to compress only relevant portions [i.e. time stamp compression] of the extracted header [fig. 3 and col. 4, ln. 8 – col. 5, ln. 50]”. (See Office Action, page 3.)

Svanbro et al. does not extract and compress only relevant portions of the header. Svanbro et al. focuses primarily on a special processing for time stamp portions of a header, but Figure 3 clearly shows that the entire header is compressed. The time stamp portion of the header is compressed by circuit 301 while the other portions of the header are compressed by conventional header compression circuit 302. Those compressed headers are recombined as compressed header 22. This is also confirmed in the specification of Svanbro et al. at column 4, line 66 - column 5, line 4 where “the other header information (non-time stamp information) output from the separator 33 can be compressed using a conventional header compression techniques at 302.” Thus, Svanbro et al. only separates the header portions to provide special processing for the time stamp portion. However, nothing in Svanbro et al. suggests that only relevant portions of a header are compressed. It is clear that all portions of the header are compressed albeit by two separate processes and recombined as the header 22 in Figure 3. Thus, the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. do not teach or suggest the processor of claim 1 in which a header compressor is “configured to compress only relevant portions of the extracted header, the relevant portions comprising a payload type header field.” Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-6 are clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al.

Independent claims 7, 9, 17, and 25 contain similar recitations (*i.e.*, compressing only relevant portions of the extracted header wherein the relevant portions comprise a payload type header field). For the sake of brevity, those claims need not be discussed in detail. However, the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. do not teach or suggest any process by which only a payload type header field is compressed. Accordingly, all claims are now believed in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicants have made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,

Alok K. Saxena et al.

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

/MJD/

---

Michael J. Donohue

Registration No. 35,859

MJD:gatc

600 Century Square

1501 Fourth Avenue

Seattle, Washington 98101-1688

Phone: (206) 622-3150

Fax: (206) 628-7699

1779931\_1.DOC